



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/066,373

02/05/2002

Masahiro Terada

0879-0374P

4546

2292

7590

12/12/2006

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH

PO BOX 747

FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

WOO, STELLA L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2614

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/066,373

Applicant(s)

TERADA, MASAHIRO

Examiner

Stella L. Woo

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17 and 19-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/08/2002.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-16 and 18 in the reply filed on November 20, 2006 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 6-8, 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami (US 6,657,654) in view of Chiloyan et al. (US 2002/0095501 A1, hereinafter "Chiloyan").

Regarding claims 1, 11-13, Narayanaswami discloses a videoconference system (col. 2, line 66 – col. 3, line 8), comprising:

computers of users (PC 136 associated with each videoconference participant enabling communication over a communication network; col. 2, line 66 – col. 3, line 8; col. 5, lines 58-62); and

electronic cameras of the users (camera assembly 116 captures video as well as still images; col. 3, lines 58-66; col. 4, lines 21-22), the electronic cameras being respectively connected to the computers duplex-communicably (via USB cable 134), wherein:

the videoconference system makes a videoconference possible by making a moving image, taken by the electronic camera of each user, displayed on display device of a computer of a communication partner (videoconferencing images are transmitted and received at PC 136; col. 5, lines 58-61);

the computer has a program for videoconference which performs the videoconference (software on PC 136 functions to perform the videoconferencing tasks; col. 5, lines 58-61).

Narayanaswami differs from claims 1, 11-13 in that it does not specify automatically booting the videoconference program when it is detected that the electronic camera is connected duplex-communicably. However, Chiloyan, from the same field of endeavor, teaches the desirability of automatically loading the appropriate program when it is detected that a peripheral device 56, such as a digital camera (paragraph 37), has been connected to a personal computer 20 through a USB port, thus, taking advantage of plug-and-play technology (paragraphs 37, 40, 44). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill at the time of invention to incorporate such plug-and-play function, as taught by Chiloyan, within the system of Narayanaswami in order to automatically initiate the videoconferencing program as soon as USB connection with the digital camera is detected, thus, simplifying operations for the videoconference user.

Regarding claims 2, 7, in Narayanaswami, camera assembly 116 includes a still camera mode in which pictures are stored in memory 212 and displayed for review (col. 5, lines 46-51).

Regarding claim 6, in Narayanaswam, note cradle 112 and cable 134.

Regarding claims 8, 14, in Narayanaswam, in videoconferencing mode, image data can be displayed at PDA display 104 as well as transferred to PC 136 (col. 5, lines 53-57).

4. Claims 3-5, 9-10, 15-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami in view of Chiloyan, as applied to claims 1, 8, 14 above, and further in view of Safai (US 6,715,003).

The combination of Narayanaswami and Chiloyan differs from claims 3-5, 9-10, 15-16 and 18 in that although Narayanaswami provides for typical photography applications (col. 3, lines 63-65), it does not explicitly describe a program for image display including displaying a list of images recorded in the computer and transmitting a selected image to a server. However, Safai teaches such well known of image operations (when a camera is connected to a personal computer, the computer executes a program that can read the stored images and display the images on the computer display; col. 1, lines 53-64; a selected image can be transmitted to a server or another user when a send button is depressed; col. 14, lines 4-11; col. 15, lines 27-32). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate such well known image displaying and transmitting operations, as taught by Safai, within the

combination of Narayanaswami and Chiloyan in order to provide convenient image handling features to the camera/PC user.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stella L. Woo whose telephone number is (571) 272-7512. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Stella L. Woo
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2614